

MS Word Exhibit 300 for DME/Mixed (BY2008) (Form) / JSC Mission Control Center (Item)

Form Report, printed by: System Administrator, Jan 31, 2007

OVERVIEW**General Information**

| | |
|--|----------------------------|
| 1. Date of Submission: | Jan 24, 2007 |
| 2. Agency: | 026 |
| 3. Bureau: | 00 |
| 4. Name of this Capital Asset: | JSC Mission Control Center |
| Investment Portfolio: | BY OMB 300 Items |
| 5. Unique ID: | 026-00-01-02-01-1406-00 |
| (For IT investments only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) | |

All investments

6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2008?

(Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M ONLY in FY2008, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY2008 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.)

Mixed Life Cycle

7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?

FY2003

8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap.

The Mission Control Center (MCC) is a "world class" spacecraft command and control facility able to support multiple spaceflight programs while reducing long term operations and maintenance cost. The MCC provides flight operations and support for all of NASA's human space flight activities.

The MCC provides the primary means of controlling crewed spacecraft operated by NASA. Ground-based flight controllers observe the spacecraft systems through telemetry sent from the spacecraft to the ground. These same controllers are also responsible for managing the control elements of the spacecraft via ground-to-vehicle commands. The MCC communications network is responsible for all communication between the controllers on the ground, all communications with the crew, and command and control of all other support staff located at sites around the globe. The MCC itself is a web of subsystems, operating in concert to provide command and control functions that support the flight controllers.

The MCC directly supports NASA's goals by providing command and control capabilities for safe mission operations of the International Space Station and Space Shuttle. The MCC provides common infrastructure architecture of distributed COTS, Unix workstations, servers, networks, voice systems, data storage and retrieval, and platform software to support multiple vehicles. The general-purpose software architecture provides a level of software infrastructure independent of program and vehicle.

Initially developed in the mid 1960s in support of NASA's Gemini program, the MCC is still in operation today supporting both the Space Shuttle and Space Station programs. While the MCC's basic mission of supporting space flight operations remains the same, the MCC's functionality has changed significantly in order to manage the increased technical complexity of our modern day Space Shuttle and Space Station systems.

Additional investments in Information Technology are necessary not only to maintain the existing equipment, but also to replace the equipment as it becomes non-maintainable due to escalating sustaining costs or due to the unavailability of commercial vendors.

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?

Yes

9.a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval?

Dec 16, 2005

10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?

Yes

12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project.

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|----------------------|-----|---------------------------------------|-----|------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----|----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12.a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12.b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12.b.1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12.b.2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12.b.3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13. Does this investment support one of the PMA initiatives? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| If "yes," select the initiatives that apply: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Human Capital</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Budget Performance Integration</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Financial Performance</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Expanded E-Government</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Competitive Sourcing</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Faith Based and Community</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Real Property Asset Management</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eliminating Improper Payments</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Privatization of Military Housing</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>R and D Investment Criteria</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Housing and Urban Development Management and Performance</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Broadening Health Insurance Coverage through State Initiatives</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Right Sized Overseas Presence</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Coordination of VA and DoD Programs and Systems</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> | | Human Capital | Yes | Budget Performance Integration | Yes | Financial Performance | | Expanded E-Government | | Competitive Sourcing | Yes | Faith Based and Community | | Real Property Asset Management | | Eliminating Improper Payments | | Privatization of Military Housing | | R and D Investment Criteria | | Housing and Urban Development Management and Performance | | Broadening Health Insurance Coverage through State Initiatives | | Right Sized Overseas Presence | | Coordination of VA and DoD Programs and Systems | |
| Human Capital | Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Budget Performance Integration | Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Financial Performance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Expanded E-Government | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Competitive Sourcing | Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Faith Based and Community | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Real Property Asset Management | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Eliminating Improper Payments | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Privatization of Military Housing | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| R and D Investment Criteria | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Housing and Urban Development Management and Performance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Broadening Health Insurance Coverage through State Initiatives | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Sized Overseas Presence | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Coordination of VA and DoD Programs and Systems | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13.a. Briefly describe how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Human Capital – The MCC fosters a culture that is built on trust, respect, teamwork, communication, creativity, and empowerment.</p> <p>Budget Performance - Objectives/goals for Shuttle Program are planned and measured accordingly through the use of the Integrated Budget and Performance Document.</p> <p>Competition - Approximately 95% of MCC funding is contracted dollars. The prime contractor for MCC operations utilizes competitively awarded procurements whenever possible.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14. Does this investment support a program assessed using OMB's Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14.a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during the PART review? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14.b. If "yes," what is the name of the PART program assessed by OMB's Program Assessment Rating Tool? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Space and Flight Support

14.c. If "yes," what PART rating did it receive?

Adequate

15. Is this investment for information technology (See section 53 for definition)?

Yes

For information technology investments only:

16. What is the level of the IT Project (per CIO Council's PM Guidance)?

Level 3

17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council's PM Guidance)

(1) Project manager has been validated as qualified for this investment

18. Is this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2006 agency high risk report (per OMB's "high risk" memo)?

No

19. Is this a financial management system?

No

19.a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area?

19.a.1. If "yes," which compliance area:

19.a.2. If "no," what does it address?

Human Spaceflight

19.b. If "yes," please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A-11 section 52.

20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2008 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

| Area | Percentage | |
|----------|------------|---|
| Hardware | 18.00 | |
| Software | 2.00 | |
| Services | 80.00 | |
| Other | | |
| Total | 100.00 | ★ |

21. If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities?

N/A

22. Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions

| | |
|--------------|-----------------------------|
| Name | Patti Stockman |
| Phone Number | (202) 358-4787 |
| Title | Privacy and Records Manager |
| Email | patti.stockman@nasa.gov |

23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval?

Yes

PERFORMANCE

Performance Information

In order to successfully address this area of the exhibit 300, performance goals must be provided for the agency and be linked to the annual performance plan. The investment must discuss the agency's mission and strategic goals, and performance measures must be provided. These goals need to map to the gap in the agency's strategic goals and objectives this investment is designed to fill. They are the internal and external performance benefits this investment is expected to deliver to the agency (e.g., improve efficiency by 60 percent, increase citizen participation by 300 percent a year to achieve an overall citizen participation rate of 75 percent by FY 2xxx, etc.). The goals must be clearly measurable investment outcomes, and if applicable, investment outputs. They do not include the completion date of the module, milestones, or investment, or general goals, such as, significant, better, improved that do not have a quantitative or qualitative measure.

Agencies must use Table 1 below for reporting performance goals and measures for all non-IT investments and for existing IT investments that were initiated prior to FY 2005. The table can be extended to include measures for years beyond FY 2006.

Table 1

| | Fiscal Year | Strategic Goal(s) Supported | Performance Measure | Actual/baseline (from Previous Year) | Planned Performance Metric (Target) | Performance Metric Results (Actual) |
|----------|-------------|--|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | 2003 | Goal 8: Ensure the provision of space access and improve it by increasing safety, reliability and affordability. Goal 9: Extend the duration and boundaries of human space flight to create new opportunities for exploration and discovery. | Availability of ground system services for MCC critical and non-critical Shuttle and Station functions for all unscheduled outages and down time. Supports the strategic goal of enhancing efficiency in operations and sustaining of the MCC. | Average actual performance for FY03 was on par with the prior year performance. | Provide 98% availability of ground system services for MCC critical and non-critical Shuttle and Station functions for all unscheduled outages and down time. | 99.8% |
| 2 | 2004 | Goal 8: Ensure the provision of space access and improve it by increasing safety, reliability and affordability. Goal 9: Extend the duration and boundaries of human space flight to create new opportunities for exploration and discovery. | Availability of ground system services for MCC critical and non-critical Shuttle and Station functions for all unscheduled outages and down time. Supports the strategic goal of enhancing efficiency in operations and sustaining of the MCC. | Average actual performance for the first three quarters of FY04 resulted in an improvement of .1%. | Provide 98% availability of non-critical functions for all unscheduled outages and down time. | 99.9% |

| | | | | | | |
|----------|------|--|--|----------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| 3 | 2004 | Goal 8: Ensure the provision of space access and improve it by increasing safety, reliability and affordability. Goal 9: Extend the duration and boundaries of human space flight to create new opportunities for exploration and discovery. | Software fault density measures software quality. Supports the strategic goal of enhancing efficiency in operations and sustaining of the MCC. | Exceeded goal. | Achieve a software fault density of no more than 1 anomaly per 5 thousand source lines of code (KSLOC) for mature software (greater than 2 years old) and 1 anomaly per 1 KSLOC for code less than 2 years old. | Averaged .14 anomaly reports in 2004. |
|----------|------|--|--|----------------|---|---------------------------------------|

All new IT investments initiated for FY 2005 and beyond must use Table 2 and are required to use the FEA Performance Reference Model (PRM). Please use Table 2 and the PRM to identify the performance information pertaining to this major IT investment. Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding "Measurement Area" and "Measurement Grouping" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for at least four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov.

Table 2

| | Fiscal Year | Measurement Area | Measurement Category | Measurement Grouping | Measurement Indicator | Baseline | Planned Improvements to the Baseline | Actual Results |
|----------|--------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| 1 | 2005 | Technology | Reliability and Availability | Availability | Availability of ground system services for MCC critical and non-critical Shuttle and Station functions for all unscheduled outages and down time. Supports the strategic goal of enhancing efficiency in operations and sustaining of the MCC. | Provide 98% availability of non-critical functions for all unscheduled outages and down time. | Increase to and maintain availability at 100% from 2005 through end of life 2016. | Averaged 99.9% availability Jan-May of 2005. |
| 2 | 2005 | Processes and Activities | Quality | Errors | Software fault density measures software quality. Errors are reported via anomaly reports. Supports the strategic goal of enhancing efficiency in operations and sustaining of the MCC. | Achieve a software fault density of no more than 1 anomaly report per thousand (.20) source lines of code (KSLOC) for mature software. | Maintain the current baseline from 2005 through end of life 2016. | Averaged .13 anomaly reports per KSLOC for the past 12 months (Aug '04-Jul '05). |
| 3 | 2005 | Customer Results | Timeliness and Responsiveness | Response Time | Implement changes to the MCC baseline that are designated as Flight Priority 1 and return the system to an operational status within the period agreed to by the user (Operational Need Date/OND). | Meet the OND for all Flight Priority 1 service requests. | Maintain the current baseline from 2005 through end of life 2016. | Currently performing at 100%. ONDs for all Flight Priority 1 service requests have been met in 2005 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------|------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---|--|
| 4 | 2005 | Mission and Business Results | Transportation | Space Operations | Provide command and control capabilities for safe mission operations of the International Space Station and Space Shuttle. | Ensure the MCC is able to provide command and control of Shuttle and Station activities without causing delays to the mission. | Maintain the current baseline from 2005 through end of life 2016. | Currently performing at 100%. The MCC has not caused a Shuttle launch or Station activity delay during the performance period. |
| 5 | 2006 | Technology | Reliability and Availability | Availability | Availability of ground system services for MCC critical and non-critical Shuttle and Station functions for all unscheduled outages and down time. | Provide 98% availability of non-critical functions for all unscheduled outages and down time. | Increase to and maintain availability at 100% through end of life 2016. | Continued to average 99.9% availability over the past 12 months (Apr 05-Mar 06) |
| 6 | 2006 | Processes and Activities | Quality | Errors | Software fault density measures software quality. Errors are reported via anomaly reports. Supports the strategic goal of enhancing efficiency in operations and sustaining of the MCC. | Achieve a software fault density of no more than 1 anomaly report per thousand (.20) source lines of code (KSLOC) for mature software. | Maintain the current baseline through end of life. | Averaged .013 anomaly reports per KSLOC for the past 12 months (Apr-05 thru Mar 06) |
| 7 | 2006 | Customer Results | Timeliness and Responsiveness | Response Time | Implement changes to the MCC baseline designated as Flight Priority 1 and return the system to operational status within the period agreed to by the user (Operational Need Date/OND). | Meet the OND for all Flight Priority 1 service requests. | Maintain the current baseline through end of life. | Currently performing at 100%. ONDs for all Flight Priority 1 service requests have been met over the past 12 mos. |
| 8 | 2006 | Mission and Business Results | Transportation | Space Operations | Provide command and control capabilities for safe mission operations of the International Space Station and Space Shuttle. | Ensure the MCC is able to provide command and control of Shuttle and Station activities without causing delays to the mission. | Maintain the current baseline through end of life. | Currently performing at 100%. The MCC has not caused a Shuttle launch or Station activity delay during the performance period. |
| 9 | 2007 | Technology | Reliability and Availability | Availability | Availability of ground system services for MCC critical and non-critical Shuttle and Station functions for all unscheduled outages and down time. | Provide 98% availability of non-critical functions for all unscheduled outages and down time. | Increase to and maintain availability at 100% through end of life 2016. | TBD |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|---|---|-----|
| 10 | 2007 | Processes and Activities | Quality | Errors | Software fault density measures software quality. Errors are reported via anomaly reports. Supports the strategic goal of enhancing efficiency in operations and sustaining of the MCC. | Achieve a software fault density of no more than 1 anomaly per 5 thousand source lines of code (KSLOC) for mature software (greater than 2 years old) and 1 anomaly per 1 KSLOC for code less than 2 years old. | Maintain the current baseline through end of life. | TBD |
| 11 | 2007 | Customer Results | Timeliness and Responsiveness | Response Time | Implement changes to the MCC baseline designated as Flight Priority 1 and return the system to operational status within the period agreed to by the user (Operational Need Date/OND). | Meet the OND for all Flight Priority 1 service requests. | Maintain the current baseline through end of life. | TBD |
| 12 | 2007 | Mission and Business Results | Transportation | Space Operations | Provide command and control capabilities for safe mission operations of the International Space Station and Space Shuttle. | Ensure the MCC is able to provide command and control of Shuttle and Station activities without causing delays to the mission. | Maintain the current baseline through end of life. | TBD |
| 13 | 2008 | Technology | Reliability and Availability | Availability | Availability of ground system services for MCC critical and non-critical Shuttle and Station functions for all unscheduled outages and down time. | Provide 98% availability of non-critical functions for all unscheduled outages and down time. | Increase to and maintain availability at 100% through end of life 2016. | TBD |
| 14 | 2008 | Processes and Activities | Quality | Errors | Software fault density measures software quality. Errors are reported via anomaly reports. Supports the strategic goal of enhancing efficiency in operations and sustaining of the MCC. | Achieve a software fault density of no more than 1 anomaly per 5 thousand source lines of code (KSLOC) for mature software (greater than 2 years old) and 1 anomaly per 1 KSLOC for code less than 2 years old. | Maintain the current baseline through end of life. | TBD |
| 15 | 2008 | Customer Results | Timeliness and Responsiveness | Response Time | Implement changes to the MCC baseline designated as Flight Priority 1 and return the system to operational status within the period agreed to by the user (Operational Need Date/OND). | Meet the OND for all Flight Priority 1 service requests. | Maintain the current baseline through end of life. | TBD |
| 16 | 2008 | Mission and Business Results | Transportation | Space Operations | Provide command and control capabilities for safe mission operations of the International Space Station and Space Shuttle. | Ensure the MCC is able to provide command and control of Shuttle and Station activities without causing delays to the mission. | Maintain the current baseline through end of life. | TBD |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|---|---|-----|
| 17 | 2009 | Technology | Reliability and Availability | Availability | Availability of ground system services for MCC critical and non-critical Shuttle and Station functions for all unscheduled outages and down time. | Provide 98% availability of non-critical functions for all unscheduled outages and down time. | Increase to and maintain availability at 100% through end of life 2016. | TBD |
| 18 | 2009 | Processes and Activities | Quality | Errors | Software fault density measures software quality. Errors are reported via anomaly reports. Supports the strategic goal of enhancing efficiency in operations and sustaining of the MCC. | Achieve a software fault density of no more than 1 anomaly per 5 thousand source lines of code (KSLOC) for mature software (greater than 2 years old) and 1 anomaly per 1 KSLOC for code less than 2 years old. | Maintain the current baseline through end of life. | TBD |
| 19 | 2009 | Customer Results | Timeliness and Responsiveness | Response Time | Implement changes to the MCC baseline designated as Flight Priority 1 and return the system to operational status within the period agreed to by the user (Operational Need Date/OND). | Meet the OND for all Flight Priority 1 service requests. | Maintain the current baseline through end of life. | TBD |
| 20 | 2009 | Mission and Business Results | Transportation | Space Operations | Provide command and control capabilities for safe mission operations of the International Space Station and Space Shuttle. | Ensure the MCC is able to provide command and control of Shuttle and Station activities without causing delays to the mission. | Maintain the current baseline through end of life. | TBD |
| 21 | 2010 | Technology | Reliability and Availability | Availability | Availability of ground system services for MCC critical and non-critical Shuttle and Station functions for all unscheduled outages and down time. | Provide 98% availability of non-critical functions for all unscheduled outages and down time. | Increase to and maintain availability at 100% through end of life 2016. | TBD |
| 22 | 2010 | Processes and Activities | Quality | Errors | Software fault density measures software quality. Errors are reported via anomaly reports. Supports the strategic goal of enhancing efficiency in operations and sustaining of the MCC. | Achieve a software fault density of no more than 1 anomaly per 5 thousand source lines of code (KSLOC) for mature software (greater than 2 years old) and 1 anomaly per 1 KSLOC for code less than 2 years old. | Maintain the current baseline through end of life. | TBD |
| 23 | 2010 | Customer Results | Timeliness and Responsiveness | Response Time | Implement changes to the MCC baseline designated as Flight Priority 1 and return the system to operational status within the period agreed to by the user (Operational Need Date/OND). | Meet the OND for all Flight Priority 1 service requests. | Maintain the current baseline through end of life. | TBD |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|---|---|---|-----|
| 24 | 2010 | Mission and Business Results | Transportation | Space Operations | Provide command and control capabilities for safe mission operations of the International Space Station and Space Shuttle. | Ensure the MCC is able to provide command and control of Shuttle and Station activities without causing delays to the mission. | Maintain the current baseline through end of life. | TBD |
| 25 | 2011 | Technology | Reliability and Availability | Availability | Availability of ground system services for MCC critical and non-critical Shuttle and Station functions for all unscheduled outages and down time. | Provide 98% availability of non-critical functions for all unscheduled outages and down time. | Increase to and maintain availability at 100% through end of life 2016. | TBD |
| 26 | 2011 | Processes and Activities | Quality | Errors | Software fault density measures software quality. Errors are reported via anomaly reports. Supports the strategic goal of enhancing efficiency in operations and sustaining of the MCC. | Achieve a software fault density of no more than 1 anomaly per 5 thousand source lines of code (KSLOC) for mature software (greater than 2 years old) and 1 anomaly per 1 KSLOC for code less than 2 years old. | Maintain the current baseline through end of life. | TBD |
| 27 | 2011 | Customer Results | Timeliness and Responsiveness | Response Time | Implement changes to the MCC baseline designated as Flight Priority 1 and return the system to operational status within the period agreed to by the user (Operational Need Date/OND). | Meet the OND for all Flight Priority 1 service requests. | Maintain the current baseline through end of life. | TBD |
| 28 | 2011 | Mission and Business Results | Transportation | Space Operations | Provide command and control capabilities for safe mission operations of the International Space Station and Space Shuttle. | Ensure the MCC is able to provide command and control of Shuttle and Station activities without causing delays to the mission. | Maintain the current baseline through end of life. | TBD |
| 29 | 2012 | Technology | Reliability and Availability | Availability | Availability of ground system services for MCC critical and non-critical Shuttle and Station functions for all unscheduled outages and down time. | Provide 98% availability of non-critical functions for all unscheduled outages and down time. | Increase to and maintain availability at 100% through end of life 2016. | TBD |
| 30 | 2012 | Processes and Activities | Quality | Errors | Software fault density measures software quality. Errors are reported via anomaly reports. Supports the strategic goal of enhancing efficiency in operations and sustaining of the MCC. | Achieve a software fault density of no more than 1 anomaly per 5 thousand source lines of code (KSLOC) for mature software (greater than 2 years old) and 1 anomaly per 1 KSLOC for code less than 2 years old. | Maintain the current baseline through end of life. | TBD |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|--|--|-----|
| 31 | 2012 | Customer Results | Timeliness and Responsiveness | Response Time | Implement changes to the MCC baseline designated as Flight Priority 1 and return the system to operational status within the period agreed to by the user (Operational Need Date/OND). | Meet the OND for all Flight Priority 1 service requests. | Maintain the current baseline through end of life. | TBD |
| 32 | 2012 | Mission and Business Results | Transportation | Space Operations | Provide command and control capabilities for safe mission operations of the International Space Station and Space Shuttle. | Ensure the MCC is able to provide command and control of Shuttle and Station activities without causing delays to the mission. | Maintain the current baseline through end of life. | TBD |

EA

Enterprise Architecture (EA)

In order to successfully address this area of the business case and capital asset plan you must ensure the investment is included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process, and is mapped to and supports the FEA. You must also ensure the business case demonstrates the relationship between the investment and the business, performance, data, services, application, and technology layers of the agency's EA.

1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture?

Yes

1.a. If "no," please explain why?

2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy?

Yes

2.a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.

JSC Mission Control Center

2.b. If "no," please explain why?

Service Reference Model

3. Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/egov/>.

Component: Use existing SRM Components or identify as "NEW". A "NEW" component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM.

Reused Name and UPI: A reused component is one being funded by another investment, but being used by this investment. Rather than answer yes or no, identify the reused service component funded by the other investment and identify the other investment using the Unique Project Identifier (UPI) code from the OMB Ex 300 or Ex 53 submission.

Internal or External Reuse?: 'Internal' reuse is within an agency. For example, one agency within a department is reusing a service component provided by another agency within the same department. 'External' reuse is one agency within a department reusing a service component provided by another agency in another department. A good example of this is an E-Gov initiative service being reused by multiple organizations across the federal government.

Funding Percentage: Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the funding level transferred to another agency to pay for the service.

| | Agency Component Name | Agency Component Description | Service Domain | Service Type | Component | Reused Component Name | Reused UPI | Internal or External Reuse? | Funding % |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|------------|-----------------------------|-----------|
| 1 | Space and Ground Network IT Support | The MCC conducts configuration management of the hardware and software that comprise the operational and development systems. | Business Management Services | Management of Processes | Configuration Management | | | No Reuse | 4.00 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|----------|-------|
| 2 | Space and Ground Network IT Support | The MCC stores real-time telemetry, trajectory, command, ground network, voice and user-created data on a variety of media. | Digital Asset Services | Document Management | Library / Storage | | | No Reuse | 3.00 |
| 3 | Space and Ground Network IT Support | The MCC stores real-time telemetry, trajectory, command, ground network, voice and user-created data on a variety of media. | Digital Asset Services | Knowledge Management | Information Sharing | | | No Reuse | 2.00 |
| 4 | Space and Ground Network IT Support | MCC analysis and statistics are carried out through mission simulations. This is the environment in which actions and decisions are assessed for their impact on operations. | Business Analytical Services | Analysis and Statistics | Mathematical | | | No Reuse | 5.00 |
| 5 | Space and Ground Network IT Support | The MCC utilizes imagery from an operational perspective to understand the relationship of objects to the spacecraft and the relationship of the crew and equipment to the spacecraft during space walks. | Business Analytical Services | Visualization | Imagery | | | No Reuse | 6.00 |
| 6 | Space and Ground Network IT Support | All MCC operational real-time data, system configuration data, application software, and audit data are recorded to tape daily. The tapes are sent to an off-site disaster recovery storage facility on a weekly basis. The MCC also archives Shuttle and Station telemetry data on optical media stored onsite at JSC for near-time retrieval. | Back Office Services | Data Management | Data Warehouse | | | No Reuse | 5.00 |
| 7 | Space and Ground Network IT Support | The MCC systems are very large and complex; therefore components are always being replaced with new technology. Integration with old technology and translation of data interfaces between old and new technology is almost always accomplished via custom software applications. | Back Office Services | Development and Integration | Legacy Integration | | | No Reuse | 2.00 |
| 8 | Space and Ground Network IT Support | Data from various input sources is written to common data stores. Custom applications are developed to integrate the data and perform computations on that data. | Back Office Services | Development and Integration | Data Integration | | | No Reuse | 2.00 |
| 9 | Space and Ground Network IT Support | Since the MCC systems support manned space flight, all hardware and software applications are thoroughly tested before being introduced into the operational environment. | Back Office Services | Development and Integration | Instrumentation and Testing | | | No Reuse | 10.00 |
| 10 | Space and Ground Network IT Support | The MCC systems are comprised of several millions of lines of custom software and written in numerous programming languages. | Back Office Services | Development and Integration | Software Development | | | No Reuse | 50.00 |
| 11 | Space and Ground Network IT Support | The Operating System auditing function is enabled on each IT System to detect intrusions. These audit logs are reviewed periodically for intrusions via manual procedures and custom software applications. | Support Services | Security Management | Intrusion Detection | | | No Reuse | 3.00 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|----------|------|
| 12 | Space and Ground Network IT Support | Access to all MCC IT systems is strictly controlled by account and password administration. This is typically accomplished through the capabilities of the operating system. | Customer Services | Customer Relationship Management | NEW | | | No Reuse | 3.00 |
| 13 | Space and Ground Network IT Support | Via the capabilities built into the operating system of each IT system, user groups are established and managed to allow group level access to applications and data. | Customer Services | Customer Relationship Management | NEW | | | No Reuse | 2.00 |
| 14 | Space and Ground Network IT Support | The Operating System auditing function is enabled on each IT System to provide audit trail capture and analysis. These logs are reviewed periodically via manual procedures and via custom software applications. | Support Services | Security Management | Audit Trail Capture and Analysis | | | No Reuse | 3.00 |

Technical Reference Model

4. To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.

FEA SRM Component: Service Components identified in the previous question should be entered in this column. Please enter multiple rows for FEA SRM Components supported by multiple TRM Service Specifications.

Service Specification: In the Service Specification field, Agencies should provide information on the specified technical standard or vendor product mapped to the FEA TRM Service Standard, including model or version numbers, as appropriate.

| SRM Component | Service Area | Service Category | Service Standard |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Configuration Management | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Software Configuration Management |
| Data Warehouse | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Database |
| Data Warehouse | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Peripherals |
| Imagery | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Database |
| Imagery | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Storage |
| Imagery | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Local Area Network (LAN) |
| Information Sharing | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Storage |
| Information Sharing | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Local Area Network (LAN) |
| Information Sharing | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Servers / Computers |
| Instrumentation and Testing | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Software Engineering | Test Management |
| Library / Storage | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Storage |
| Mathematical | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Database |
| Mathematical | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Database / Storage | Storage |
| Mathematical | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Local Area Network (LAN) |
| Mathematical | Service Platform and Infrastructure | Hardware / Infrastructure | Servers / Computers |

| |
|---|
| 5. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)? |
| No |
| 5.a. If "yes," please describe. |
| |
| 6. Does this investment provide the public with access to a government automated information system? |
| No |
| 6.a. If "yes," does customer access require specific software (e.g., a specific web browser version)? |
| |
| 6.a.1. If "yes," provide the specific product name(s) and version number(s) of the required software and the date when the public will be able to access this investment by any software (i.e. to ensure equitable and timely access of government information and services). |
| |

RISK

Risk Management

You should perform a risk assessment during the early planning and initial concept phase of the investment's life-cycle, develop a risk-adjusted life-cycle cost estimate and a plan to eliminate, mitigate or manage risk, and be actively managing risk throughout the investment's life-cycle.

Answer the following questions to describe how you are managing investment risks.

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?

Yes

1.a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan?

Aug 10, 2004

1.b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?

No

1.c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:

2. If there is currently no plan, will a plan be developed?

2.a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date?

2.b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?

3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule: (O&M investments do NOT need to answer.)

The project employed a Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (as defined in OMB Circular A-94) in comparing the alternatives. The alternative is cost-effective if, on the basis of life cycle cost analysis of competing alternatives, it is determined to have the lowest costs expressed in present value terms. Cost effectiveness analysis is being used because it is unnecessary or impractical to consider the dollar value of the benefits provided by the alternatives. This is a case when each alternative has the same annual effects and dollar values cannot be assigned to their benefits.

In addition to the total cost of ownership, risk analysis and sensitivity analysis was used in understanding the risk-adjusted costs. The project has accounted for risk in each of the alternatives reviewed.

There are residual risks that are common to all alternatives and that are basically unavoidable. These risks include

- a) the risk entailed with buying and using high performance technology that is at the leading edge - systems that are sold in small numbers and so are not field-proven - systems that are not as reliable as servers and microcomputers sold by the millions;
- b) risks of a dynamically evolving market, with vendors and product lines entering and exiting frequently, and with products evolving rapidly at the edge of what is technically possible;
- c) risk of changes in user workload composition and size and that the workload may not be well-suited to the platform;
- d) limited supply of staff with the specialized skills required to configure, operate, and maintain these specialized machines - in particular, finding system administrators with the specialized skills required for specific machines.

The project has accounted for risks as defined in the Risk Management plan. All risks have been quantified and are included as a cost. Additionally, these risks are taken into consideration in the Acquisition Strategy and are tracked through-out the life cycle of the projects by project management processes including Operational Analysis.

COST & SCHEDULE

Cost and Schedule Performance

1. Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard – 748?

Yes

2. Answer the following questions about current cumulative cost and schedule performance. The numbers reported below should reflect current actual information. (Per OMB requirements Cost/Schedule Performance information should include both Government and Contractor Costs):

2.a. What is the Planned Value (PV)?

113.125

2.b. What is the Earned Value (EV)?

111.688

2.c. What is the actual cost of work performed (AC)?

30.071

2.d. What costs are included in the reported Cost/Schedule Performance information?

Contractor and Government

2.e. "As of" date:

Apr 16, 2006

3. What is the calculated Schedule Performance Index (SPI= EV/PV)?

0.99

4. What is the schedule variance (SV = EV-PV)?

-1.437

5. What is the calculated Cost Performance Index (CPI = EV/AC)?

3.71

6. What is the cost variance (CV = EV-AC)?

81.617

7. Is the CV or SV greater than 10%?

Yes



7.a. If "yes," was it the CV or SV or both?

CV

7.b. If "yes," explain the variance.

The Actual Cost (AC) calculated by Prosight reflects IT-related DME for the MCC, including Government and MSOC budget. The PV and EV data provided above reflects only MSOC contracted costs for the MCC. Further, the MSOC data contains IT, non-IT, steady state, and DME.

7.c. If "yes," what corrective actions are being taken?

No corrective action is being taken as MSOC's total cost variance for the MCC is within the established threshold of +/-5%. The cost variance calculated above is not a valid indicator of actual cost performance.

7.d. What is most current "Estimate at Completion"?

25.886

8. Have any significant changes been made to the baseline during the past fiscal year?

No

8.a. If "yes," when was it approved by OMB?

Actual Performance against the Current Baseline

Complete the following table to compare actual performance against the current performance baseline and to the initial performance baseline. In the Current Baseline section, for all milestones listed, you should provide both the baseline and actual completion dates (e.g., "03/23/2003" / "04/28/2004") and the baseline and actual total costs (in \$ Millions).

| | Description of Milestone | Initial End Date | Initial Total Cost (\$mil) | Planned End Date | Actual End Date | Planned Total Cost (\$mil) | Actual Total Cost (\$mil) | Schedule Variance (# of days) | Cost Variance (\$mil) | Percent Complete |
|---|-----------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| 1 | FY06 Incremental Development Cost | Sep 30, 2006 | 11.888 | Sep 30, 2006 | Sep 30, 2006 | 11.890 | 13.150 | 0 | 1.260 | 58.00 |
| 2 | FY06 Operations Cost | Sep 30, 2006 | 44.661 | Sep 30, 2006 | Sep 30, 2006 | 32.770 | 38.231 | 0 | 5.461 | 58.00 |
| 3 | FY07 Incremental Development Cost | Sep 30, 2007 | 9.125 | Sep 30, 2007 | | 9.125 | | | | 0.00 |
| 4 | FY07 Operations Cost | Sep 30, 2007 | 41.984 | Sep 30, 2007 | | 32.860 | | | | 0.00 |
| 5 | FY08 Incremental Development Cost | Sep 30, 2008 | 15.312 | Sep 30, 2008 | | 15.312 | | | | 0.00 |
| 6 | FY08 Operations Cost | Sep 30, 2008 | 48.119 | Sep 30, 2008 | | 32.810 | | | | 0.00 |
| 7 | FY06 Operations Cost | Sep 30, 2006 | 44.661 | Sep 30, 2006 | Sep 30, 2006 | 32.770 | 38.231 | 0 | 5.461 | 58.00 |

| | | | DME | Steady State | Total |
|---------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|-----|--------------|-------|
| Completion date: Current Baseline: | | Total cost: Current Baseline: | | | |
| Estimated completion date: | | Estimate at completion: | | | |